



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/941,386	08/28/2001	James C. Ori	705558US1	5998

24938 7590 02/21/2003

DAIMLERCHRYSLER INTELLECTUAL CAPITAL CORPORATION
CIMS 483-02-19
800 CHRYSLER DR EAST
AUBURN HILLS, MI 48326-2757

EXAMINER

GUTMAN, HILARY L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3612

DATE MAILED: 02/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/941,386

Applicant(s)
Ori et al.

Examiner
Hilary Gutman

Art Unit
3612



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hilary Gutman

(3) _____

(2) Donald Wallace

(4) _____

Date of Interview Feb 10, 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: claim 2

Identification of prior art discussed:
Vlahovic and Norlin

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The applicant faxed in a proposed amendment after final with changes to claim 2. The examiner believes the changes overcome the final rejection (set forth in the office action mailed 12/20/2002) but warrant further consideration and/or search. In addition, the examiner pointed the applicant's attention to the reference Aloe et al. (from the IDS) which shows two tubular members at right angles to each other and with a structural member therebetween at the joint. More specifically, the examiner believes this reference may potentially read on claim 2 as amended since portions of the structural member are of the same cross sections as the two tubular members to thereby allow the structural member to fit within the tubular members. However, the examiner noted that the tubular members were not co-linear and also that the entire structural member did not fit within the tubular members since a portion of the structural member extends from and is not "covered" or encapsulated within the tubular members.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

D. GLENN DAYOAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Hilary Gutman 2/10/03
Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.